



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,517	09/11/2003	Mamoud Sadre		3614
7590 09/20/2010				
Mamoud Sadre Unit # 203 165 Tremont Street Boston, MA 02111			EXAMINER ROBERTSON, DAVID	
			ART UNIT 2121	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/20/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/659,517	SADRE, MAMOUD	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Dave Robertson	2121	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) Dave Robertson.

(2) Mr. Mamoud Sadre (pro se).

**Date of Interview:** 17 September 2010

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☒ Yes    ☐ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description: *Interim Guidance for Determining Subject Matter Eligibility for Process Claims in View of Bilski v. Kappos (21Jul2010) Fed. Reg. 43922.*

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
*none*

Claims discussed:  
*none*

Prior art documents discussed:  
*none*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**Status of Application:** Non-final awaiting response

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 2pm

/Dave Robertson/  
 Examiner, Art Unit 2121

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed claims as currently presented and subject matter discussed (8/17/2010 at Interview) for further examination as potentially unpatentable in view of "Interim Guidance....in view of Bilski v Kappos". Discussed priority of present application in view of abandonment of parent application prior to the filing of the CIP. Applicant said he believed the abandonment date was extended; Examiner agreed to review. Examiner suggested Applicant file a response to the office action of July 8, 2010, substantially as discussed at interview, with further consideration of the "Interim Guidance..." document provided (attached), timely within the response date of Oct. 8, 2010. Examiner further suggested to the applicant that it may be desirable to employ a registered patent attorney or agent, particularly with regard to the issues raised by the Bilski Supreme Court decision and guidance thereto provided by the office (as cited above) to legal patent practitioners and applicants. Examiner indicated further interview may be warranted upon review of issues raised, prior to subsequent office action.